

**PERFORMANCE EVALUATION OF REGULAR AND FIN-
INTEGRATED OFFSHORE PIPELINES SUBJECTED TO
TRANSVERSE PIPE DISPLACEMENT IN SOFT CLAYEY
SEABED**

DEBTANU SETH



**DEPARTMENT OF CIVIL ENGINEERING
INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY DELHI**

MARCH 2025

**PERFORMANCE EVALUATION OF REGULAR AND FIN-
INTEGRATED OFFSHORE PIPELINES SUBJECTED TO
TRANSVERSE PIPE DISPLACEMENT IN SOFT CLAYEY
SEABED**

by

DEBTANU SETH

DEPARTMENT OF CIVIL ENGINEERING

submitted

in fulfilment of requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY



INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY DELHI

MARCH 2025

Dedicated to my parents Ms. **Tanushree** and Mr. **Debashis Seth**,

and brother **Debopam**

DECLARATION

I hereby declare that, except where specific reference is made to the work of others, the contents of this thesis are my original work and have not been submitted, in whole or in part, for consideration toward any other degree or diploma at this or any other university. I further confirm that this dissertation is entirely the result of my own efforts and does not include any outcomes of work conducted in collaboration, unless explicitly stated. I also affirm that the guidelines provided by the institute have been strictly adhered to in the preparation of this thesis.

Date:

Debtanu Seth

New Delhi

CERTIFICATE

This is to certify that the thesis titled “**Performance Evaluation of Regular and Fin-Integrated Offshore Pipelines Subjected to Transverse Pipe Displacement in Soft Clayey Seabed**”, submitted by **Mr. Debtanu Seth** to the Indian Institute of Technology Delhi is a record of bonafide research work carried out by him under our supervision and guidance. This thesis work, in our opinion, has reached the standard of fulfilling the requirements for a **Doctor of Philosophy** degree. The research report and results presented in this thesis have not been submitted, in part or full, to any University or Institute for the award of the degree or diploma.

Dr. Bappaditya Manna

Professor,
Department of Civil Engineering,
IIT Delhi
New Delhi - 110016

Dr. J. T. Shahu

Professor,
Department of Civil Engineering,
IIT Delhi
New Delhi - 110016

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This research work would not have been possible without the invaluable support of numerous individuals, to whom I extend my heartfelt gratitude. First and foremost, I express my profound appreciation to my advisors, Prof. Bappaditya Manna and Prof. J. T. Shahu, whose exceptional guidance and unwavering support have been instrumental throughout my doctoral journey. Their profound insights, expertise, and dedication in reviewing countless drafts and providing constructive feedback have significantly shaped this thesis. The privilege of working under their mentorship has been truly transformative.

I am deeply indebted to the Student Research Committee (SRC) members, Prof. A.K. Keshari, Prof. P. Vangla, and Prof. B.P. Patel, whose insightful critiques and valuable suggestions have substantially enhanced the quality of my research. I extend my sincere appreciation to Prof. Tiago Ferradosa from the University of Porto for his collaborative spirit and significant contributions to our research endeavors.

I am particularly grateful to Prof. Vasant Matsagar, Head of the Department, whose leadership has been crucial in providing the resources and opportunities that have facilitated this research. I also acknowledge the constant encouragement received from the faculty members of the Department of Civil Engineering throughout my research tenure.

The technical support provided by the laboratory staff of the Geotechnical and Rock Engineering section has been essential to the success of this project. I extend special thanks to Mr. Dharmendra and Mr. Alok Kumar for their expert assistance during various stages of the experimental work. My sincere appreciation also goes to Mr. Manoj Kumar Nilam, Mr. Jiwesh Ram, Mr. Manish, and Mr. Ram Janam for their dedicated support during the model tests.

I am deeply grateful to my fellow researchers Ms. Namrata Bhattacharjee, Mr. Souryadeep Biswas, Mr. Koushik Das, and Ms. Sayanti Banerjee, whose camaraderie and intellectual support have enriched my research experience. Special appreciation goes to my seniors, Dr. Prasun Halder and Dr. Sujata Fulambarkar, for their mentorship, timely guidance, and constant encouragement throughout this journey. I extend my heartfelt gratitude to Ms. Baibhabshri Roy, whose steadfast support have been a source of strength along this endeavour.

I extend my sincere appreciation to my seniors who have been instrumental in this journey: Mr. Vinay Kr. Singh, Dr. Mayuresh Bakare, Dr. Deepesh Bansal, Dr. Harshal Peshne, Dr. Debiprasad Nayak, Dr. Debaprakash Parida, Dr. Abdullah Ansari, Dr. Kavita Tandon, Ms. Shipra Sinha, and Dr. Abhishek Srivastava. Their guidance and support have been invaluable. I am particularly thankful to my co-research scholars and friends who have shared this academic journey with me: Ms. Nekita Borah, Mr. Arpan Nandi, Dr. Ravi Raj, Ms. Sriparna Roy, Mr. Rajeev Ranjan, Dr. Somya Ranjan Patra, Mr. Ashwinth Raj, Ms. Stuti Mishra, Mr. Lalit Kandpal, Mr. Girish Chand, Ms. Shruti Raut, Ms. Gouri Nayek, Ms. Arpita Mondal, Ms. Jyoti Rani Nath, Dr. Akash Santra, Dr. Rita Majumdar, Dr. Arkajyoti De, Dr. Rupayan Roy, Mr. Subhashis Bag, and Ms. Adrika Banerjee.

I am deeply grateful to those who encouraged me to embark on this doctoral journey: Ms. Rituparna Das, Ms. Niharika Nahak, Dr. Sumit Kumar, Mr. Gaurav Anand, Dr. Mrinal Bhowmik, Ms. Sonali Raut, Ms. Manaswini Mishra, Mr. K.V. Balaya, Ms. Chitra Verma, Mr. Koushik, and Ms. Subhashree Dalai. I extend my heartfelt gratitude to Mr. Subhadeep Hui, Mr. Koushik Mondal, Mr. Ayan Guchhait, and Mr. Bivash Mondal for their steadfast friendship and unwavering support throughout this journey. Your encouragement and friendship have been invaluable, and I am deeply thankful for your presence during this significant chapter of my life.

I am profoundly grateful to my family, who have been the bedrock of my academic journey. My deepest gratitude goes to my parents, Ms. Tanushree Dey Seth and Mr. Debashis Seth, whose unwavering support and sacrifices have made this achievement possible. I am forever indebted to my grandparents, Mr. Jitendra Nath Dey, Ms. Shefali Dey, Late Mr. Samaresh Seth, and Ms. Uma Rani Seth, for their boundless love and blessings. Their collective patience, understanding, and steadfast emotional support have been my source of strength throughout this challenging journey. Without their unconditional love and encouragement, this accomplishment would have remained but a distant dream.

Completing this Ph.D. has been a challenging yet deeply fulfilling journey, and I am truly grateful for the unwavering support of so many wonderful people. Thank you for being part of this milestone and for making this experience so special. If I have unintentionally left anyone out, please know it is a limitation of memory and not of my gratitude. I also thank the Almighty for the health and strength that have carried me through. Lastly, I want to thank myself for believing, persevering, and embracing every step of this incredible journey.

Place: New Delhi

Date:

Debtanu Seth

ABSTRACT

Buried offshore pipelines are crucial for the swift transportation of oils and similar fluidised materials from the oil rigs to the processing centre or vice versa. However, offshore pipelines are susceptible to buckling due to their high slenderness ratio, and the resistance to such displacement relies on pipeline stiffness and soil resistance. A novel alternative of integrating radial fins into these pipelines was explored through a series of 1g laboratory model tests and numerical methods to mitigate the global buckling of pipelines by enhancing the global buckling resistance. Thus, in this study, the pipe soil interaction during the global buckling of a fin-integrated pipe section (FP) has been explored and compared with the buckling behaviour of a regular pipeline to understand the feasibility of the FP in improving the buckling behaviour of a pipe section. To fulfil this primary objective, a series of scaled model tests have been performed, followed by several finite element analyses, by varying the number and orientation of radial fins, pipe embedment depth, strength parameters of soil, and the direction of buckling-induced pipe movement. In the current study, the pipe-soil interaction of the offshore pipelines was considered for surface-laid pipelines subjected to vertical penetration and buried pipe sections subjected to vertically upward and lateral displacement due to thermal buckling. Furthermore, the load-displacement behaviour of the pipe, pressure around the pipe section, soil surface heaving, and the displacement field within the surrounding soil were examined thoroughly and illustrated and discussed comprehensively. The observation from the experimental studies and the prediction from the numerical studies helped to understand the buckling behaviour of offshore pipelines, along with the efficiency of the radial fins in enhancing the buckling resistance of the pipe sections. Moreover, a sensitivity analysis revealed the impact of various soil and geometric parameters on the buckling resistance and their order of influence. Finally, a general optimized pipe section was proposed to resist

buckling in each direction by balancing the material consumption and the buckling resistance provided by the particular fin configuration.

दफ़न की गई अपतटीय पाइपलाइनों का तेल एवं अन्य तरल पदार्थों को तेल रिग से प्रसंस्करण केंद्र या इसके विपरीत परिवहन करने में अत्यधिक महत्व है। तथापि, अपतटीय पाइपलाइनों में उनके उच्च पतलेपन अनुपात के कारण बकलिंग (मोड़ने) की प्रवृत्ति होती है, और इस प्रकार के विस्थापन का प्रतिरोध पाइपलाइन की कठोरता और मिट्टी के प्रतिरोध पर निर्भर करता है। इस समस्या के समाधान हेतु, इन पाइपलाइनों में रेडियल फिन्स को एकीकृत करने का एक नवीन विकल्प प्रस्तावित किया गया है। इस अध्ययन में 1g प्रयोगशाला मॉडल परीक्षणों और संख्यात्मक विधियों की एक श्रृंखला के माध्यम से पाइपलाइनों की वैश्विक बकलिंग को कम करने और उनकी बकलिंग प्रतिरोध क्षमता को बढ़ाने का प्रयास किया गया।

इस शोध में फिन-समाहित पाइप खंड (FP) के वैश्विक बकलिंग के दौरान पाइप-मिट्टी परस्पर क्रिया का विश्लेषण किया गया और इसे परंपरागत पाइपलाइन के बकलिंग व्यवहार से तुलना की गई, जिससे पाइप खंड के बकलिंग व्यवहार में सुधार के लिए FP की व्यवहार्यता को समझा जा सके। इस उद्देश्य की पूर्ति हेतु, विभिन्न स्केल्ड मॉडल परीक्षण किए गए, जिनका अनुसरण संख्यात्मक तत्वीय विश्लेषण द्वारा किया गया। इन विश्लेषणों में रेडियल फिन्स की संख्या और अभिविन्यास, पाइप की गहराई, मिट्टी के शक्ति मापदंड, और बकलिंग-प्रेरित पाइप विस्थापन की दिशा में परिवर्तन किया गया।

अध्ययन में सतह पर स्थित पाइपलाइनों के ऊर्ध्वाधर प्रवेशन तथा थर्मल बकलिंग के कारण ऊर्ध्वाधर ऊपर और पार्श्व विस्थापन के अधीन दफ़न पाइप खंडों की पाइप-मिट्टी परस्पर क्रिया पर विचार किया गया। इसके अतिरिक्त, पाइप के भार-विस्थापन व्यवहार, पाइप खंड के चारों ओर का दबाव, मिट्टी की सतह पर होने वाले उभार, तथा आसपास की मिट्टी में विस्थापन क्षेत्र का विश्लेषण किया गया। इन अवलोकनों को गहनता से चित्रित और चर्चा की गई।

प्रयोगात्मक और संख्यात्मक अध्ययनों से प्राप्त निष्कर्षों ने अपतटीय पाइपलाइनों के बकलिंग व्यवहार को समझने तथा पाइप खंडों की बकलिंग प्रतिरोध क्षमता को बढ़ाने में रेडियल फिन्स की प्रभावशीलता को प्रमाणित किया। इसके अतिरिक्त, संवेदनशीलता विश्लेषण ने बकलिंग प्रतिरोध पर विभिन्न मिट्टी एवं ज्यामितीय मापदंडों के प्रभाव और उनके अनुक्रम को रेखांकित किया। अंततः, सामग्री खपत और विशिष्ट फिन विन्यास द्वारा प्रदान किए गए बकलिंग प्रतिरोध के बीच संतुलन स्थापित करते हुए प्रत्येक दिशा में बकलिंग का प्रतिरोध करने हेतु एक सामान्यीकृत अनुकूलित पाइप खंड प्रस्तावित किया गया।

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DECLARATION	I
CERTIFICATE	III
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	V
ABSTRACT	IX
संक्षेप	XI
TABLE OF CONTENTS	XIII
LIST OF FIGURES	XXI
LIST OF TABLES	XXXV
LIST OF SYMBOLS	XXXVII
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	XLV
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	1
1.1. GENERAL	1
1.2. Importance of the Study	4
1.3. Organization of the Thesis	6
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW	9
2.1. General	9
2.2. Buckling of Pipeline	10
2.2.1. Surface-laid and partially embedded pipeline	10
2.2.1.1. Vertical global buckling	11
2.2.1.1.1. <i>Analytical models</i>	12
2.2.1.1.2. <i>Numerical models</i>	13
2.2.1.2. Lateral global buckling	17
2.2.1.2.1. <i>Analytical models</i>	18
2.2.1.2.2. <i>Numerical models</i>	23

2.2.1.2.3. <i>Experimental models</i>	27
2.2.2. Buried pipeline	28
2.2.2.1. Vertical global buckling	29
2.2.2.1.1. <i>Analytical models</i>	29
2.2.2.1.2. <i>Numerical models</i>	36
2.2.2.1.3. <i>Experimental models</i>	41
2.2.2.2. Lateral global buckling	43
2.2.2.2.1. <i>Analytical models</i>	43
2.2.2.2.2. <i>Numerical models</i>	44
2.2.2.2.3. <i>Experimental models</i>	45
2.3. Effect of Axial Soil Resistance on the Pipe Buckling	46
2.4. Effect of External Loads on the Pipe Buckling	50
2.4.1. External pressure	50
2.4.1.1. Buckling of an initially perfect pipe	51
2.4.1.1.1 <i>Elastic buckling</i>	51
2.4.1.1.2 <i>Plastic buckling</i>	51
2.4.1.2. Buckling of an initially dented pipeline	53
2.4.2. Bending	55
2.5. Buckling Mitigation Techniques	57
2.5.1. Increase in pipe embedment depth	57
2.5.2. Increase in pipe diameter	58
2.5.3. Rock dumping	58
2.5.4. Pipe clamping mattresses	59
2.5.5. Rectangular pin buckle arrestor	59
2.6. Summary	61
2.7. Critical Observation and Research Gap	63

2.8. Research Objective	63
2.9. Scope of the Study	64
CHAPTER 3: EXPERIMENTAL INVESTIGATION	67
3.1. General	67
3.2. Materials	68
3.2.1. Soft clay-bed	68
3.2.2. Pipe	69
3.3. Experimental Setup	72
3.3.1. Loading frame	72
3.3.2. Test chamber	73
3.3.3. Loading arrangement	74
3.3.4. Problem statement	75
3.4. Test Procedure	76
3.4.1. Tank preparation	77
3.4.2. Soil bed preparation	77
3.4.3. Pipe setup and instrumentation	78
3.4.3.1. Linear variable differential transformer (LVDT) and Load cell	79
3.4.3.2. Miniature earth pressure transducers (MEPT)	79
3.4.3.3. Data acquisition systems (DAQ)	80
3.5. Image Analysis Using PIV	81
3.5.1. Equipment and arrangement	81
3.5.2. Selection of the control points and seeds	83
3.5.3. Data processing for image analysis	87
3.6. Brief Description of the Testing Procedure	87
3.7. Test Program	89
3.8. Test Results	92

3.7. Summary	93
CHAPTER 4: TEST RESULTS UNDER VERTICAL PENETRATION	95
4.1. General	95
4.2. Load Displacement Behaviour	95
4.2.1. Variation of penetration resistance	96
4.2.2. Fin efficiency	97
4.2.3. Comparison with literature	100
4.3. Earth Pressure Subjected on the Pipeline during Vertical Penetration	102
4.3.1. Variation of earth pressure on the pipe with vertical penetration	102
4.3.2. Pressure distribution around the pipe	105
4.4. Failure Mechanism of Soil using PIV	108
4.4.1. Displacement contours	109
4.4.2. Soil compression below the pipe invert	113
4.4.3. Formation of the shear band and the expansion of vertical displacement	114
4.4.4. Surface heaving around the pipe-sections	116
4.5. Summary	119
CHAPTER 5: TEST RESULTS UNDER UPLIFT PIPE DISPLACEMENT	121
5.1. General	121
5.2. Load-Displacement Behaviour	122
5.2.1. Variation of uplift resistance	122
5.2.2. Fin efficiency	125
5.2.3. Effect of suction on the uplift resistance	128
5.2.4. Comparison with literature	130
5.3. Pressure Subjected to the Pipeline during Upheaval Displacement	133
5.3.1. Variation of pressure at the pipe crown and the invert	133
5.3.2. Distribution of pressure at the pipe crown and the invert	137

5.4. Displacement Behaviour of the Soil using Particle Image Velocimetry	139
5.4.1. Failure mechanism of soil using vectorial displacement	140
5.4.2. Failure mechanism of soil using displacement field	143
5.4.3. Soil compression above the pipe section	147
5.4.4. Expansion of vertical displacement and formation of shear band	150
5.5. Surface Heave above the Pipe Section	156
5.6. Summary	158
CHAPTER 6: TEST RESULTS UNDER LATERAL PIPE DISPLACEMENT	161
6.1. General	161
6.2. Load-Displacement Behaviour	162
6.2.1. Variation of lateral capacity	162
6.2.2. Fin efficiency	164
6.2.3. Comparison with the literature	169
6.3. Pressure Subjected to the Pipeline during Upheaval Displacement	171
6.3.1. Variation of pressure at the front and rear spring-line of the pipe	171
6.3.2. Pressure distribution at the front and back spring-line of the pipe	173
6.4. Displacement of Soil around the Pipe-Section using PIV	176
6.4.1. Visualization using vectorial displacement	176
6.4.2. Visualization using coloured contour	180
6.4.3. Soil compression in front of the pipe section	183
6.4.4. Expansion of horizontal displacement and formation of shear band	186
6.5. Temporal Variation of the Surface Heave	189
6.6. Summary	192
CHAPTER 7: TEST RESULTS UNDER PIPE EMBEDMENT DEPTH VARIATION	193
7.1. General	193

7.2. Load-Displacement Behaviour	193
7.2.1. Variation of buckling capacity	194
7.2.2. Fin efficiency	195
7.3. Pressure Subjected to the Pipeline during Upheaval Displacement	197
7.3.1. Variation of pressure at the crown and invert of the pipe	197
7.3.2. Variation of pressure at the front and rear spring-line of the pipe	199
7.3.3. Pressure distribution at the crown and invert of the pipe	200
7.3.4. Pressure distribution at the front and rear spring-line of the pipe	201
7.4. Displacement of Soil around the Pipe Section Using PIV	202
7.4.1. Visualization using vectorial displacement	203
7.4.2. Visualization using coloured contour for pipe uplift	205
7.4.3. Layer-wise deformation and formation of shear band	209
7.4.3.1. Upheaval pipe displacement	209
7.4.3.2. Lateral pipe displacement	212
7.5. Summary	214
CHAPTER 8: NUMERICAL ANALYSIS AND PARAMETRIC STUDY	217
8.1. General	217
8.2. Background (PLAXIS 2D)	219
8.3 Details of the Finite Element Simulation of the Model Tests	219
8.3.1 Geometry and domain Size	219
8.3.2 Boundary dimension and the boundary condition	220
8.3.3 Mesh convergence study	220
8.3.4 Details of the elements	223
8.3.5 Material modelling	224
8.3.6. Application of upheaval displacement	226
8.3.7. Phases of analysis	226

8.3.8. Comparison of numerical and model test results	226
8.4 Parametric Study of the Prototype during Pipe Uplift	229
8.4.1 Model geometry	229
8.4.2 Constitutive models	230
8.4.3. Parametric variation and the baseline case	230
8.4.4. Predicted parametric trends	231
8.4.4.1. Influence of fin configuration.	231
8.4.4.2. Influence of soil compressibility (λ and κ)	233
8.4.4.3. Influence of critical stress ratio (M_{CSL})	235
8.4.4.4. Influence of saturated unit weight of soil (γ_{sat})	237
8.4.4.5. Influence of pipe diameter (D)	238
8.4.4.6. Influence of pipe embedment depth (H/D)	240
8.4.4.7. Influence of normalized fin width (w_f/D)	242
8.4.4.8. Optimal design parameter ranges	244
8.4.5. Sensitivity analysis	246
8.4.6. Details of analysis using ANN	247
8.4.7. Performance of the ANN	248
8.4.8. Ranking of the parameters	249
8.5 Summary	253
CHAPTER 9: CONCLUSIONS	255
9.1. General	255
9.2. Conclusions Based on Research Objectives	256
9.3. Future Scope	264
REFERENCES	267
LIST OF PUBLICATION BASED ON THESIS	293
Journals (Published)	293

Journals (Communicated)	293
Journals (Under Preparation)	294
Conferences (International and National)	294
CURRICULUM VITAE	295

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1.1.	The proposal of offshore pipeline laying by different countries in the outlook year of 2021-2025.	3
Figure 2.1.	Vertical displacement of pipeline due to presence of (a) initial imperfection and (b) fault in the seabed.	11
Figure 2.2.	Variation of critical buckling temperature with vertical deflection for different initial imperfection (Mondal & Dhar, 2017)	14
Figure 2.3.	Influence of initial pipe imperfection on critical buckling force (Xu & Lin, 2017).	15
Figure 2.4.	Lateral buckling or snaking of a surface-laid pipeline.	18
Figure 2.5.	Comparison predicted result from eq. 2.13 and 2.14 with results obtained from FE Analysis (Merifield et al., 2008).	21
Figure 2.6.	Idealised shapes (a). Shape 1, and (b) Shape 2 used in the analytical study (Liu et al., 2014).	22
Figure 2.7.	Variation of normalized lateral resistance of a partially buried pipeline with pipe displacement and pipe weight (Chatterjee et al., 2012).	24
Figure 2.8.	Idealization of pipe response during the lateral motion for ‘light’ and ‘heavy’ pipes (Chatterjee et al., 2012).	25
Figure 2.9.	Schematic diagram of upheaval buckling of buried pipeline.	29
Figure 2.10.	Comparison of uplift resistance vs uplift displacement behaviour for different methods of analysis (Liu et al., 2015).	35
Figure 2.11.	Variation of uplift resistance with displacement for various embedment depths (Robert and Thusyanthan 2015).	37
Figure 2.12.	Variation of uplift resistance with soil cover depth and soil unit weight for both NT and FT conditions and for rough pipeline surface (Maitra et al., 2016).	38

Figure 2.13.	Typical displacement contour for soil failure during pipe uplifting in NT condition, a conceptual diagram from the FEA generated displacement contour by Seth et al. (2021a).	38
Figure 2.14.	Influence of soil cover depth and soil unit weight on lateral capacity factor of an offshore pipeline under NT and FT condition (Seth et al. 2021a).	44
Figure 2.15.	Comparison of axial resistance vs axial movement behaviour for different methods of analysis. (Liu et al., 2015).	49
Figure 2.16.	Influence of diameter to thickness ratio and initial ovality of the pipeline on the collapse pressure of pipeline under external pressure (Ramasamy and Ya 2014).	55
Figure 2.17.	Buckling mitigation techniques (a) rock dumping (Source: https://dwinirestu.wordpress.com) (b) pipe clamping mattress (Source: Hamdan et al., (2023)) (c) pin buckle arrestor (Source: Rao and Kaliveeran, (2019)).	61
Figure 3.1.	Dry powdered kaolin clay.	68
Figure 3.2.	Grain size distribution of Kaolin clay.	68
Figure 3.3.	Variation of the void ratio of kaolin clay as a function of normal stress on it, obtained from consolidation test.	68
Figure 3.4.	Photographs of the pipe sections used in vertical penetration tests: (a) top view of 3FC1 pipe; front view of (b) Regular pipe, (c) C1 configuration pipe, (d) C2 configuration pipe, and (e) C3 configuration pipe.	70
Figure 3.5.	Configurations of the pipe section for upheaval and lateral displacement tests: (a) RP, (b) 3FC1, (c) 3FC2, (d) 4FC1, (e) 4FC2, (f) 6FC1, and (g) 6FC2.	71
Figure 3.6.	Loading frame.	72
Figure 3.7.	The test chamber used in the current study (a) Dimensions of the tank; (b) additional pulley-cable arrangement attached to the tank.	73

Figure 3.8.	Photo of the loading arrangement for vertical penetration and upheaval displacement of pipes (a) Filled tank and actuator, (b) Controller computer and data logger, (c) Compressor.	75
Figure 3. 9.	Photo of the loading arrangement for the lateral displacement tests of the pipe.	76
Figure 3.10.	Schematic diagram of a typical test setup for the pipe uplift test.	76
Figure 3.11.	Depth-wise variation of undrained shear strength for (a) 9 kPa and (b) 13 kPa seabed, and (c) location of the vane shear test.	78
Figure 3.12.	Instruments used to record the data.: Load displacement behaviour - (a) 100 mm LVDT, and (b) 'S' shape 10 kN Load cell; Surface heaving - (c) 50 mm LVDT; Pressure distribution around the pipe - (d) miniature earth pressure transducer.	80
Figure 3.13.	Photographs of the data acquisition (DAQ) system: (a) HEICO DAQ cum actuator controller, and (b) NI DAQ system.	81
Figure 3.14.	Components of the image acquisition system.	83
Figure 3.15.	Seeding the soil for image analysis before the commencement of the experiment: (a) Soil cross-section before spraying sands (seeds); (b) The observation window is opened, and sand is sprayed uniformly on the exposed soil surface; (c) The observation window is closed and the pipe is fixed on the levelled soil bed using a tie rod.	84
Figure 3.16.	The ASR of the digitally captured images for the considered range.	85
Figure 3.17.	The variation of the standard deviation of the pixel intensities of the images with ASR.	86
Figure 3.18.	Different steps of the testing scheme.	89
Figure 3.19.	Photograph of the test environment	91
Figure 3.20.	Applied displacement versus uplift capacity plot	92
Figure 3.21.	Pressure variation at the pipe crown during pipe uplift	92

Figure 3.22.	Surface heave around a pipe section during pipe uplift	93
Figure 4.1.	The effect of radial fin on the penetration resistance of a pipeline resting on a clay bed of (a) 9 kPa and (b) 13 kPa undrained shear strength.	97
Figure 4.2.	Variation of fin efficiency with normalized pipe penetration for different pipe configurations with (a) 9 kPa and (b) 13 kPa shear strength of soil.	101
Figure 4.3.	The peak fin efficiency under 0-0.5D and 0.5-1D displacements for (a) 9kPa and (b) 13kPa soil bed and various fin configurations.	99
Figure 4.4.	The predicted penetration resistance value was obtained from the equation proposed by previous authors and the present study for soil strengths of (a) 9 kPa and (b) 13 kPa.	99
Figure 4.5.	Variation of pressure around the pipeline during vertical penetration of (a) regular pipe, (b) C1 pipe, (c) C2 pipe, and (d) C3 pipe, laid on 9kPa (subscript 1) and 13 kPa (subscript 2) sea bed.	103
Figure 4.6.	Pressure distribution around a pipeline laid on the surface of a 9 kPa soil-bed and for vertical penetration (a) lesser than 0.5 D and (b) 0.5 – 1 D.	105
Figure 4.7.	Pressure distribution around a pipeline laid on the surface of a 13 kPa soil-bed and for vertical penetration (u) (a) lesser than 0.5 D and (b) 0.5 – 1 D.	105
Figure 4.8.	Formation of the plastic zone within a soil volume around (a) a rectangular and (b) a cylindrical section as per (Qin et al., 2019).	108
Figure 4.9.	Displacement of the soil adjacent to the pipe-section during the penetration of the regular pipe section, illustrated using (a) vectorial displacement, (b) horizontal contour, (c) vertical contour and (d) resultant contour.	110

Figure 4.10.	Displacement of the soil adjacent to the pipe-section while the penetration of the C1 pipe-section, illustrated using (a) vectorial displacement, (b) horizontal contour, (c) vertical contour and (d) resultant contour.	111
Figure 4.11.	Displacement of the soil adjacent to the pipe-section while the penetration of the C2 pipe-section, illustrated using (a) vectorial displacement, (b) horizontal contour, (c) vertical contour and (d) resultant contour.	111
Figure 4.12.	Displacement of the soil adjacent to the pipe-section while the penetration of the C3 pipe-section, illustrated using (a) vectorial displacement, (b) horizontal contour, (c) vertical contour and (d) resultant contour.	111
Figure 4.13.	Variation of the compression ratio below the pipe invert along the pipe centerline for (a) 9 kPa and (b) 13 kPa soil bed.	113
Figure 4.14.	Distribution of vertical displacements and shear band formation below the penetrating pipeline for (a) 9kPa_RP, (b) 9kPa_C2, (c) 13 kPa_RP and (d) 13kPa_C2 cases	115
Figure 4.15.	The behaviour of the surface heave for different pipe configurations laid on a 9kPa soft soil bed and subjected to a penetration of 42 mm: (a) Regular pipe, (b) C1 pipe, (c) C2 pipe, and (d) C3 pipe.	116
Figure 4.16.	The temporal variation of surface heave around a pipe-section penetrating (a) 9 kPa soil-bed (measured heave at 7.33 cm), (b) 9 kPa soil-bed (measured heave at 14.67 cm), (c) 13 kPa soil-bed (measured heave at 7.33 cm), and (d) 13 kPa soil-bed (measured heave at 14.67 cm).	117
Figure 5. 1.	Configuration of the fin integrated pipes for uplift of pipe section (a) Regular pipe, (b) 3FC1, (c) 3FC2, (d) 4FC1, (e) 4FC2, (f) 6FC1, and (g) 6FC2.	121

Figure 5.2.	Variation of the uplift capacity with normalized upheaval displacement for different fin configurations and pipe embedment depth (a) $H/D = 1$ and (b) $H/D = 8$.	123
Figure 5.3.	Efficiency of fins for different fin configurations and embedment depth of (a) $H/D = 1$ and (b) $H/D = 8$.	125
Figure 5.4.	Peak efficiency of fins for different fin configurations and embedment depth of (a) $H/D = 1$ and (b) $H/D = 8$.	127
Figure 5.5.	Influence of the suction release at the pipe bottom on the load-displacement behaviour of a pipeline with: (a) 4FC1 configuration and $H/D = 1$; (b) 4FC1 configuration and $H/D = 8$; (c) 4FC2 configuration and $H/D = 1$; and, (d) 4FC2 configuration and $H/D = 8$;	130
Figure 5.6.	Comparison of the current study with the previous studies.	131
Figure 5.7.	Variation of the pressure for different fin configurations and $H/D = 1$, at the pipe (a) crown and, (b) invert.	134
Figure 5. 8.	Variation of the pressure for different fin configurations and $H/D = 8$, at the pipe (a) crown and, (b) invert.	135
Figure 5. 9.	Distribution of the contact pressure at the pipe crown and, invert for different fin configurations and $H/D = 1$, and for displacement range of (a) 0 to 0.6D and, (b) 0.6D to 1.2D.	137
Figure 5. 10.	Distribution of the contact pressure at the pipe crown and, invert for different fin configurations and $H/D = 8$, and for displacement range of (a) 0 to 0.6D and, (b) 0.6 to 1.2D.	138
Figure 5.11.	Visualization of the soil behaviour above the pipe section using displacement vectors for a normalized embedment depth of 1, and pipe configurations of (a) RP, (b) 3FC1, (c) 3FC2, (d) 4FC1, 4FC2, (f) 6FC1, and (g) 6FC2.	140
Figure 5.12.	Visualization of the soil behaviour above the pipe section using displacement vectors for a normalized embedment depth of 8,	142

	and pipe configurations of (a) RP, (b) 3FC1, (c) 3FC2, (d) 4FC1, (e) 4FC2, (f) 6FC1, and (g) 6FC2.	
Figure 5.13.	Visualization of the soil behaviour above the pipe section using displacement field for a normalized embedment depth of 1, and pipe configurations of (a) RP, (b) 3FC1, (c) 3FC2, (d) 4FC1, (e) 4FC2, (f) 6FC1, and (g) 6FC2.	144
Figure 5.14.	Visualization of the soil behaviour above the pipe section using displacement field for a normalized embedment depth of 8, and pipe configurations of (a) RP, (b) 3FC1, (c) 3FC2, (d) 4FC1, (e) 4FC2, (f) 6FC1, and (g) 6FC2.	146
Figure 5.15.	Compression of the soil above the pipe section corresponding to the (a) peak uplift resistance and (b) maximum applied pipe displacement for $H/D = 1$.	148
Figure 5.16.	Compression of the soil above the pipe section corresponding to the (a) peak uplift resistance and (b) maximum applied pipe displacement for $H/D = 8$.	149
Figure 5.17.	Distribution of vertical displacements and shear band formation above the uplifting pipeline for a normalized embedment depth of 1, and pipe configurations of (a) RP, (b) 3FC1, (c) 3FC2, (d) 4FC1, (e) 4FC2, (f) 6FC1, and (g) 6FC2.	152
Figure 5.18.	Distribution of vertical displacements and shear band formation above the uplifting pipeline for a normalized embedment depth of 8 and pipe configurations of (a) RP, (b) 3FC1, (c) 3FC2, (d) 4FC1, (e) 4FC2, (f) 6FC1, and (g) 6FC2.	155
Figure 5.19.	The variation of surface heave above a buried pipe section moving in the upward direction, for an embedment depth of (a) $H/D = 1$, (measured heave at 7.33 cm), (b) $H/D = 1$, (measured heave at 14.67 cm), (c) $H/D = 8$, (measured heave at 7.33 cm), and (d) $H/D = 8$, (measured heave at 14.67 cm).	157

Figure 6.1.	Configuration of the fin integrated pipes for lateral displacement of pipe section (a) Regular pipe, (b) 3FC1, (c) 3FC2, (d) 4FC1, (e) 4FC2, (f) 6FC1, and (g) 6FC2.	161
Figure 6.2.	Comparison of the relationship between the lateral capacity and lateral displacement for different pipe configurations, and pipe embedment depth of (a) $H/D = 1$, and (b) $H/D = 8$	164
Figure 6.3.	Variation of fin efficiency of the fin integrated pipe sections with lateral displacement for pipe embedment depth of (a) $H/D = 1$, and (b) $H/D = 8$	165
Figure 6.4.	Variation of peak fin efficiencies of different FP within different displacement ranges and pipe embedment depth of (a) $H/D = 1$, and (b) $H/D = 8$	166
Figure 6.5.	Comparison of the order of the failure mechanism and the fin efficiency for different pipe configuration and the pipe embedment depth of (a) $H/D = 1$ and (b) $H/D = 8$.	168
Figure 6.6.	Comparison of the observation from the current study with the previous literature.	169
Figure 6.7.	Variation of the pressure for different fin configurations and $H/D = 1$, at the pipe (a) front spring-line and, (b) back spring-line.	172
Figure 6.8.	Variation of the pressure for different fin configurations and $H/D = 8$, at the pipe (a) front spring-line and, (b) back spring-line.	172
Figure 6.9.	Distribution of the contact pressure at the pipe front spring-line and, back spring-line for different fin configurations and (a) $H/D = 1$, and (b) $H/D = 8$.	174
Figure 6.10.	Visualization of the soil behaviour in front of the pipe section using displacement vectors for a normalized embedment depth of 1, and pipe configurations of (a) RP, (b) 3FC1, (c) 3FC2, (d) 4FC1, 4FC2, (f) 6FC1, and (g) 6FC2.	177
Figure 6.11.	Visualization of the soil behaviour in front of the pipe section using displacement vectors for a normalized embedment depth	179

	of 8, and pipe configurations of (a) RP, (b) 3FC1, (c)3FC2, (d) 4FC1, 4FC2, (f) 6FC1, and (g) 6FC2.	
Figure 6.12.	Visualization of the soil behaviour in front of the pipe section using displacement fields for a normalized embedment depth of 8, and pipe configurations of (a) RP, (b) 3FC1, (c)3FC2, (d) 4FC1, (e) 4FC2, (f) 6FC1, and (g) 6FC2.	181
Figure 6.13.	Visualization of the soil behaviour in front of the pipe section using displacement fields for a normalized embedment depth of 8, and pipe configurations of (a) RP, (b) 3FC1, (c)3FC2, (d) 4FC1, 4FC2, (f) 6FC1, and (g) 6FC2.	183
Figure 6.14.	Compression of the soil in front of the pipe section corresponding to the maximum applied pipe displacement and the linear lateral strain along the center-line of the pipe for (a) $H/D=1$, and (b) $H/D=8$.	185
Figure 6.15.	Distribution of horizontal displacements and shear band formation in front of the laterally moving pipeline for (a) RP and $H/D=1$, (b) 3FC1 and $H/D=1$, (c) RP and $H/D=8$, and (d) 3FC1 and $H/D=8$.	187
Figure 6.16.	The variation of surface heave above a buried pipe section moving in the upward direction, for an embedment depth of $H/D=1$, at locations (a) L_1 , and (b) L_2 .	190
Figure 6.17.	The variation of surface heave above a buried pipe section moving in the upward direction, for an embedment depth of $H/D=8$, at locations (a) L_1 , and (b) L_2 .	191
Figure 7.1.	Variation of the load-displacement behaviour of the (a) regular, and (b) 3FC1 pipe sections with the pipe embedment depth.	194
Figure 7.2.	Variation of the capacity factors with the pipe embedment depth.	195

Figure 7.3.	Variation of fin efficiency for the 3FC1 pipe section with normalized pipe displacement across different pipe embedment depths, in (a) upward, and (b) lateral direction.	196
Figure 7.4.	Variation of pressure with uplift displacement at the pipe (a) crown, and(b) invert across different pipe embedment depths.	198
Figure 7.5.	Variation of pressure with lateral pipe displacement at the pipe (a) front, and(b) back springline across different pipe embedment depths.	199
Figure 7.6.	Pressure distribution at the pipe crown and invert during uplift displacement of (a) RP and (b 3FC1 pipe sections.	201
Figure 7.7.	Pressure distribution at the pipe front and back spring-line during lateral displacement of (a) RP and (b 3FC1 pipe section.	202
Figure 7.8.	Visualization of the soil behaviour in front of the pipe section using displacement vectors, for uplift displacement of (a) RP_H/D=1, (b) RP_H/D=2, (c) RP_H/D=4, (d) RP_H/D=8, (e) 3FC1_H/D=1, (f) 3FC1_H/D=2, (g) 3FC1_H/D=4, and (h) 3FC1_H/D=8.	203
Figure 7.9.	Visualization of the soil behaviour in front of the pipe section using displacement vectors, for lateral displacement of (a) RP_H/D=1, (b) RP_H/D=2, (c) RP_H/D=4, (d) RP_H/D=8, (e) 3FC1_H/D=1, (f) 3FC1_H/D=2, (g) 3FC1_H/D=4, and (h) 3FC1_H/D=8.	204
Figure 7.10.	Visualization of the soil behaviour in front of the pipe section using displacement vectors, for uplift displacement of (a) RP_H/D=1, (b) RP_H/D=2, (c) RP_H/D=4, (d) RP_H/D=8, (e) 3FC1_H/D=1, (f) 3FC1_H/D=2, (g) 3FC1_H/D=4, and (h) 3FC1_H/D=8.	207
Figure 7.11.	Visualization of the soil behaviour in front of the pipe section using displacement vectors, for uplift displacement of (a) RP_H/D=1, (b) RP_H/D=2, (c) RP_H/D=4, (d) RP_H/D=8, (e)	208

	3FC1_ $H/D=1$, (f) 3FC1_ $H/D=2$, (g) 3FC1_ $H/D=4$, and (h) 3FC1_ $H/D=8$.	
Figure 7.12.	Layer-wise soil deformation above RP during uplift displacement: (a) $H/D = 1$, (b) $H/D = 2$, (c) $H/D = 4$, (d) $H/D = 8$, and (e) variation of the angle of failure surface with H/D .	210
Figure 7.13.	Layer-wise soil deformation above 3FC1 during uplift displacement: (a) $H/D = 1$, (b) $H/D = 2$, (c) $H/D = 4$, (d) $H/D = 8$, and (e) variation of the angle of failure surface with H/D .	211
Figure 7.14.	Layer-wise soil deformation above RP during lateral displacement: (a) $H/D = 1$, (b) $H/D = 2$, (c) $H/D = 4$, (d) $H/D = 8$, (e) variation of the angle of lower failure surface with H/D , and (f) variation of the angle of upper failure surface with H/D .	212
Figure 7.15.	Layer-wise soil deformation above 3FC1 during lateral displacement: (a) $H/D = 1$, (b) $H/D = 2$, (c) $H/D = 4$, (d) $H/D = 8$, (e) variation of the angle of lower failure surface with H/D , and (f) variation of the angle of upper failure surface with H/D .	213
Figure 8.1.	A schematic diagram of the problem statement.	220
Figure 8.2.	Mesh convergence study: (a) Variation of the results with different mesh size, and (b) comparison between the variation in Nu and the computation cost for a representative case.	222
Figure 8.3.	Schematic diagram of the discretised soil volume.	223
Figure 8.4.	A comparison of the load-displacement behaviour, obtained from the experimental study and finite element analysis, performed for (a) regular and (b) fin-integrated pipelines.	227
Figure 8.5.	Comparison of the surface heaving obtained from the experimental study and finite element analysis for regular, and fin pipelines with (a) shallow and (b) deep embedment depth during upheaval pipe movement.	228
Figure 8.6.	A comparison of the load-displacement behaviour, obtained from the experimental study and finite element analysis,	228

	performed for (a) regular and (b) fin-integrated pipelines during lateral pipe movement.	
Figure 8.7.	Effect of fin configuration on the load-displacement behaviour during (a) upheaval, and (b) lateral pipe displacement.	232
Figure 8.8.	Failure mechanisms for (a) RP and (b) 3FC1 pipe sections, with an embedment depth ratio of $H/D = 1$.	232
Figure 8.9.	Effect of compressibility of the soil (I) on the load-displacement behaviour of a 3FC1 pipe section, during (a) upheaval, and (b) lateral pipe displacement, and for $H/D = 4$.	234
Figure 8.10.	Effect of recompression index of the soil (k) on the load-displacement behaviour of a 3FC1 pipe section, during (a) upheaval, and (b) lateral pipe displacement, and for $H/D = 4$.	235
Figure 8.11.	Effect of critical stress ratio of the soil (M_{CSL}) on the load-displacement behaviour of a 3FC1 pipe section, during (a) upheaval, and (b) lateral pipe displacement, and for $H/D = 4$.	236
Figure 8.12.	Effect of saturated soil unit weight (γ_{sat}) on the load-displacement behaviour of a 3FC1 pipe section, during (a) upheaval, and (b) lateral pipe displacement, and for $H/D = 4$.	237
Figure 8.13.	Effect of pipe diameter (D) on the load-displacement behaviour of a 3FC1 pipe section, during (a) upheaval, and (b) lateral pipe displacement, and for $H/D = 4$.	239
Figure 8.14.	Effect of pipe embedment depth ratio (H/D) on the load-displacement behaviour of a 3FC1 pipe section, during (a) upheaval, and (b) lateral pipe displacement, and for $H/D = 4$.	241
Figure 8.15.	Variation of the failure mechanism with pipe embedment depth, during (a) uplift and (b) lateral pipe displacement	242
Figure 8.16.	Effect of normalized fin width (w_f/D) on the load-displacement behaviour of a 3FC1 pipe section, during (a) upheaval, and (b) lateral pipe displacement, and for $H/D = 4$.	243

- Figure 8.17.** The variation between the target and predicted variables for (a) $N_{u,max}$ and (b) $N_{h,max}$ using ANN. 249
- Figure 8.18.** A visual representation of the importance of different input parameters based on their influence on the (a) peak uplift capacity ($N_{u,max}$) and (b) peak uplift capacity ($N_{h,max}$) using connecting weight approach. 252

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.1.	Details of some longest pipelines.	2
Table 2.1.	Parameter used in the Numerical models for uplift resistance of surface laid pipeline.	15
Table 2.2.	Parameter used in the Numerical models for lateral resistance of surface laid pipeline.	25
Table 2.3.	Parameter used in the Numerical models for uplift resistance of buried pipeline.	39
Table 2.4.	Parameter used in the Numerical models for lateral resistance of buried pipeline.	45
Table 3.1.	Properties of the Kaolin clay used in the tests.	69
Table 3.2.	Material properties of the model pipe section.	72
Table 3.3.	Arrangement of the pressure sensors.	80
Table 3.4.	Summary of the vertical penetration test plan.	90
Table 3.5.	Summary of the uplift and lateral pipe displacement test plan.	90
Table 3.6.	Summary of the test plan for the uplift and lateral displacement of the optimized pipe with pipe embedment depth.	90
Table 4.1.	Comparison of the fitting parameters of the current and the previous study.	102
Table 8.1.	Mesh size optimization ($RP_{H/D}=2$).	260
Table 8.2.	The test program, demonstrating baseline parameters, range of variation and the number of numerical simulations.	268
Table 8.3.	Optimal design parameters.	283
Table 8.4.	Performance assessment of the constructed neural network.	286
Table 8.5.	Ranking of different parameters using connection weight approach.	289

LIST OF SYMBOLS

a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4	Fitting coefficients.
A	Cross-sectional area of pipeline.
A_1	Calculation parameters relative to soil properties and experimentally determinate.
A_2	Modification coefficient of the normal stress on the pipeline and experimentally determinate.
A_s	Cross-sectional area of soil lifted in vertical slip mechanism.
A_{soil}	Area of soil block above the pipe.
b_1, b_2, b_3, b_4, b_5	Fitting coefficients.
B	Base width of the pipeline.
c_1	1.48
c_2	0.955
c	Cohesion of soil.
C_c	Compression index
C_s	swelling index
c_u	Undrained cohesion.
c_v	Coefficient of consolidation.
C_{22}	Element of stiffness matrix.
d	Maximum drainage path length during consolidation.
d_d	Depth of dent.
D	Pipe Diameter.
$D_0 = (D-t)$	Pipe mean diameter.
D_e	Elasticity matrix.
E'	Strain hardening modulus.
EI	Bending stiffness.
E_p	Modulus of elasticity of pipeline.
E_s	Modulus of elasticity of soil.
f	Yield function.

f_o	The initial ovality of the pipeline.
f_l	Lateral resistance of soil.
f_c'	Factor for the effect of cohesion on anchor behaviour and is a function of embedment ratio, friction angle and surcharge pressure above the soil.
f_{NBA}	Factor for obtaining $s_{u,eff}$ for the 'kz' component of s_u .
f_g'	The anchor capacity factor for the basic case of a smooth anchor resting in a soil and is corrected for soil dilatancy, anchor roughness and initial stress state.
F_{brk}	Breakout resistance of pipeline
ΔF_H	Horizontal loading rate
F_H	Horizontal loading on pipeline
F_R	Passive soil resistance exerted on the
F_Z	Vertical hydrodynamic lift load on pipeline
g	Gravitational acceleration
g_p	Plastic potential function.
h	Hardening modulus.
H_m	Maximum buckle amplitude of pipeline.
w	Buckle amplitude of pipeline.
I_p	Second moment of area of cross section of pipeline.
k	Incremental soil strength rate.
k_{cr}	Critical curvature of an initially dented pipeline.
k_i	Critical curvature of an intact pipeline.
k_{ou} and k_{ov}	Factors determining the initial stiffness.
k_u	Limiting value for the axial resistance.
k_v	Limiting value for the lateral resistance.
k_t	Rate of strength increase per decade
K	Coefficient of lateral earth pressure;
L	Buckle length.
L_0	Buckle length of the imperfection topology.
L_{cr}	Critical length of pipeline (Zhu et al. 2015).

M_{cr}	Ultimate bending moment of an initially dented pipeline.
M_i	Ultimate bending moment of an intact pipeline.
N_c	Capacity factor, a function of pipe roughness = 10
N_{ch}	Lateral interaction factor dependent on burial depth ratio.
N_p	Bearing capacity factor of the pipeline and function of the pipeline roughness ($9.14 < N_p < 11.94$) (Bransby et al. 2002)
N_u	Uplift capacity factor.
N_h	Horizontal capacity factor.
$N_{u(weightless)}$	Uplift capacity factor of soil considering weightless soil.
N_{u0}	Uplift capacity for pipe placed at the surface of weightless soil.
$N_{u(limit)}$	Limiting values of $N_{u(weightless)}$ as proposed by Randolph and Houlsby (1984).
p_h	Hydrostatic pressure.
p_i	Internal pressure on the pipeline.
P	Axial compressive force.
P_c	Collapse pressure for a pipeline.
P_{cr}	Critical axial force.
P_o	Yield pressure of the pipeline.
P_p	Buckle propagation pressure.
$P_{suction}$	Additional suction force per unit length.
P_v	Net uplift force per unit length.
$P_{v,total}$	Total uplift force per unit length.
q	Vertical distributed force on the pipeline.
q_u	Collapse load of an anchor.
r	Outer radius of the pipeline.
r_m	Mean radius = $(D-t)/2$.
s_u	Undrained shear strength of soil.
s_{um}	Shear strength of soil at mud-line.
s_{u0}	Original shear strength prior to any rate effect or softening.
$s_{u,eff}$	Effective undrained shear strength of soil at considered depth.

$s_{u,ref}$	Undrained shear strength at the soil surface.
S_t	Sensitivity of clay.
t	Pipe wall thickness.
t_{con}	Time of consolidation.
t_{plough}	Depth of ploughing.
T_i	Initial temperature of pipeline.
T_{if}	Temperature of transporting product.
T_s	Ambient temperature.
ΔT	Temperature difference between transporting fluid and the outside of pipe.
Δu	Displacement rate.
u	Displacement of pipeline.
U	Average degree of consolidation.
V_H	Horizontal resistance on pipeline.
$V_{H,res}$	Residual horizontal resistance on pipeline.
$V_{H,berm}$	Berm resistance during large pipe displacement.
$V_{H,max}$	Maximum horizontal resistance on pipeline.
V_p	Penetration resistance on pipeline.
V_t	Total ultimate uplift force of the pipeline.
V_u	Uplift resistance on pipeline.
$V_{u,max}$	Vertical bearing capacity on pipeline.
H	Pipe embedment depth (distance between the top surface of sea-bed and the top of the pipeline).
w_d	Reverse embedment depth or depth of the pipe bottom from the top of the soil-bed.
w_h	Depth from sea-bed to the bottom of the anchor;
W_P	Pipe weight per unit length.

W_s	Total weight of the soil block above the pipe per unit length.
W_s'	Effective (buoyant) weight of the soil block above the pipe per unit length.
W_p'	Effective (buoyant) weight of the pipe per unit length.
V_a	Axial resistance of pipes.
$V_{a,max}$	Maximum axial resistance of pipes.
Δz	Thickness of soil layer.
Z	Considered depth within the seabed.
Z_w	Water depth.
α	Thermal expansion coefficient of Steel.
α_a	Activation factor for the clay strength which is between zero and unity.
α_d	Dirac's function determined by elastic or plastic state.
β_1 and β_2	Skew parameters.
β_3	Curve fitting parameter.
γ_p	Unit weight of steel.
γ_{ref}	Reference shear strain rate.
γ_s	Effective unit weight of soil.
γ_s'	Submerged unit weight of soil.
δ	Function of normalised berm area (A_{berm}/D^2) and berm resistance, ($V_{H,berm}$).
δ_a	Axial displacement of pipeline.
$\delta_{a,max}$	Axial displacement corresponding to $V_{a,max}$.
$\delta_{u,max}$	Displacement corresponding to $V_{u,max}$.
δ_u	Vertical displacement.

δ_H	Horizontal displacement.
$\delta_{H,max}$	Horizontal displacement corresponding to $V_{H,max}$.
ε_B	Bending strain of pipeline.
ε_T	Tangent modulus.
ε_S	Secant modulus.
ε_u	Total strain at ultimate strength of steel.
ξ_{95}	Accumulated plastic strain at which 95% soil strength reduction occurs by remoulding
θ	Friction angle for the pipeline-cover interface
κ	Slope of recompression curve.
λ	Compressibility of soil.
λ_1 and λ_2	Curve fitting parameter
λ_3	Normalized dent length in the pipe hoop direction
μ	Coefficient of friction between the soil and the model pipe
μ_{lr}	Interface roughness
μ_{lt}	Interface tensile capacity
μ_L	Lateral friction coefficients
ν_p	Poisson's ratio of steel
ν_{ph}	Horizontal pipeline penetration rate
ν_{pv}	Vertical pipeline penetration rate
ν_s	Poisson's ratio of soil
ρ_c	Density of the outer concrete coating of pipeline
ρ_{if}	Density of transporting material through the pipeline

ρ_i	Density of the transporting
ρ_p'	Submerged Density of steel
ρ_s'	Submerged Density of soil
ρ_w	Density of seawater
σ_o	API yield stress (0.5% strain offset)
σ_u	Specified minimum tensile strength of steel
σ_v'	Effective stress in the backfill
σ_y	Specified minimum yield strength of steel
τ_{int}	Pipe/soil interface shear strength
$\tau_{u,ave}$	Average drained shear strength
ϕ	Friction angle of soil
ψ	Dilation angle of soil

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ALA	American Lifeline Alliance
API	American Petroleum Institute
CMOS	Complementary Metal-Oxide Semiconductor
DNV	Det Norske Veritas
DSLR	Digital Single-Lens Reflex
FE	Finite Element
FP	Fin-integrated Pipe section
FT	Full Tension condition
HP-HT	High pressure-high temperature
IS	Indian Standard code
LVDT	Linear Variable Differential Transducer
MC	Mohr Coulomb model
MCC	Modified Cam Clay model
MPT	Miniature Pressure Transducers
NT	No Tension condition
ROI	Region Of Interest
RP	Regular Pipe section
scm	standard cubic meters

